

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/509,369	SUZUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tamra L. Dicus	1774	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Pamela R. Schwartz.

(3) Steven Funk, Joe Keating.

(2) Tamra L. Dicus.

(4) Ryoji Yamashita.

Date of Interview: 27 July 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.


Identification of prior art discussed: Mori.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


PAMELA R. SCHWARTZ
PRIMARY EXAMINEER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner will withdraw the 112 second rejection in the next Office Action. Applicant pointed to the reference 11, FIG. 1 in the Office Action as the suppressing member, however the Examiner pointed also to col. 2, lines 40-60 describing the suppressing member and being made of metal, which is reference 2, FIG. 1. Applicant also desires to amend the suppressing member layer to be partially on the base as shown in 3, FIG. 1 of the instant specification so as not to extend laterally across the base as shown in Mori. The Examiner will reconsider once the amendment is submitted.